



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/990,026 12/12/97 OZAKI

T 381NT43975

WM02/0327
EVENSON MCKEDOWN EDWARDS & LENAHAH
1200 G STREET N W SUITE 700
WASHINGTON DC 20005

EXAMINER

BROWN, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2611

DATE MAILED:

03/27/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/990,026

Applicant(s)
Ozaki, et al

Examiner
Reuben M. Brown

Group Art Unit
2611



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 20, 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 58 and 59 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 58 and 59 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2611

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batchelor, (U.S. Pat # 5,724,103), in view of Hidary, (U.S. Pat # 5,774,664).

Considering amended claim 58, the claimed terminal device of a media integrating system comprising a display block for displaying information is met by the monitor 30 of Batchelor. The claimed input control block for accepting an input instruction from outside the terminal device is necessarily included in Batchelor, in that personal computer systems require at least a keyboard for a user to input instructions. The claimed memory for storing a program is met by the DRAM device 34 and hard disk drive 36, (Fig. 1; col. 2, lines 14-54). The claimed broadcast receiving block for receiving broadcast information to extract video, audio and data is met by the receiver

Art Unit: 2611

24, NTSC decoder 28 and VBI decoder 26. The claimed additional limitation of a package control block for reading from a package is met by optical disk drive 38. The claimed further limitation of package control block for writing data to a package is met by the operation of Batchelor, wherein the user has the option of saving the retrieved text/graphic information to a file so that the information may be recalled by the user, (col. 3, lines 11-12).

The claimed CPU for executing program and performing control on the blocks is disclosed by the CPU 32 of Batchelor, (col. 2, lines 49-54). The claimed additional means of a broadcast receiving block which acquires link information for giving an instruction for reading particular information from the package such that the package control block is controlled by link information to read information stored in the package and display the read information, is met by the operation of Batchelor, in that text/graphics information are read from the CD-ROM and displayed on the monitor, in coordination with the received TV broadcast, (col. 1, lines 41-54; col. 3, lines 13-29).

Batchelor does not specifically disclose the additional limitation of the "communication control block communicating with information providing device". It is noted that this limitation merely reads on connecting the personal computer system 10 of Batchelor to an external network, such as the Internet. Connecting a computer to the Internet in order to obtain information is extremely well known in the art, and is demonstrated by Hidary. The claimed communication

Art Unit: 2611

control block for performing communication with an information providing device is met by the operation of Hidary which discloses Internet access for the TV/PC system 16, (col. 5, lines 21-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the personal computer system 10 of Batchelor, with the feature of interfacing with a modem, for the known improvements in a multimedia environment of enabling a user terminal device to interface with a TV broadcast network, as well as a communication network as taught by Hidary, (col. 1, lines 17-61).

The claimed information providing device is broad enough to read on an Internet server, which provides information to end users, necessarily included in Hidary. The claimed CPU for executing a program and performing control on each of the blocks is necessarily included in Hidary, (col. 4, lines 28-57). The claimed information reading means that, based on link information added to a broadcast signal for giving an instruction for reading information stored in an information providing device, controls the communication control block to read information from the information providing device is met by the operation of Hidary, (Abstract; col. 4, lines 28-56) which discusses a means for providing URL links in TV broadcast program which allows for related information to be provided from an information provider/Internet server.

The further claimed limitation of adding link formation to a broadcast signal for giving instruction for reading information stored in a package and controlling the package control block

Art Unit: 2611

to read the stored information from the package device reads on Batchelor, (col. 2, lines 49-54), in that text/graphics information are read from the CD-ROM and displayed on the monitor, in coordination with the received TV broadcast.

Regarding the additional claimed limitation of wherein the broadcast information, particular information read from the package device and information from the information providing device are displayed simultaneously on the user's display device. Accordingly, Fig. 2 of Batchelor shows a screen of a user's display device which includes a window 40 that displays broadcast TV programming and a separate window 42, which simultaneously shows information retrieved from an optical disk 38, see col. 2, lines 55-67. Moreover, Hidary is directed to a multi-media-integrated system which enables a user to view web pages from the Internet, based on URL's embedded in broadcast TV programming or from URL's embedded in package devices such as video tapes or DVD. Hidary furthermore teaches that information from the broadcast TV programming may concurrently be displayed on a display device, along with web pages from the Internet, preferably in an adjacent window, col. 8, lines 19-44).

Thus both Batchelor and Hidary use similar multi-window technology in order to concurrently display information from multiple media sources. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Batchelor by concurrently displaying information from any number of sources such as a package

Art Unit: 2611

device, broadcast TV program and the Internet, for the desirable benefit of more efficiently and coherently presenting the multiple media sources to the user, as motivated by the disclosure of Hidary (col. 1, lines 65-67- col. 2, lines 1-12; col. 2, lines 54-67), which clearly teaches the benefits of combining multiple media information in a manner that is most useful to the consumer. Thus the combination of Batchelor (Fig. 2) and Hidary, (col. 8, lines 19-44) provides for the simultaneous display of multiple media sources using the technique of multiple windows on a viewers display device.

The present claims recites the newly amended claimed feature, wherein the particular information which is read from a package device, includes third link information which gives instruction for reading another information from the information providing device (Internet server), and controls the information providing device to read the another information. Examiner points out that the package devices disclosed in Hidary, includes video data which is also comprised of URL links or buttons, (col. 9, lines 3-9 & col. 10, lines 1-2). These URL links will control the information providing device to read another information, at least according a user's selection of the instant third link information read out from particular information, which is stored on a package device.

Hidary also teaches that as a user views an interactive program on a TV set, the user's terminal device may [automatically] detect and extract URL links embedded in the instant video

Art Unit: 2611

data, retrieve and display the corresponding web page on the user's monitor, see col. 8, lines 45-62. Thus the web pages are [automatically] synchronized with the TV content. As previously discussed by the examiner, Hidary teaches that the interactive video content may be retrieved from a package device, instead of TV broadcast. Thus operating Hidary within Batchelor, would provide for URL links within video content retrieved from a package device, which automatically retrieves the corresponding Internet content from an Internet server, whereas the particular retrieved area of the instant package device is determined from links within a broadcast TV, as discussed in Batchelor, (Abstract).

3. Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Batchelor & Hidary, in view of Mages, (U.S. Pat # 5,892,825).

Considering claim 58, the claimed elements of a terminal device of a media integrating system, comprising elements which are in common with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 58, are likewise analyzed.

The additional claimed limitation of controlling the package control block based on instructions of a third link information added to the information providing device, is not specifically shown by Batchelor & Hidary. Nevertheless, Mages discloses a method of controlling

Art Unit: 2611

the particular information read from a package device, according to a URL link which a user clicks while browsing a web page, (col. 5, lines 65-67 thru col. 6, lines 1-55). Mages discusses an Internet server, which upon the request of a user provides a key to user's remote computer, such as audio/video header information, which relates to particular information stored on a CD-ROM at a user's computer, which enables the user's CD-ROM reader to read the instant audio/video information. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Hidary with the teachings of Mages, for the known desirable purpose of a multimedia device which more efficiently utilizes the convergence of CD-ROM and the Internet technologies as taught by Mages (col. 3, lines 28-60; col. 5, lines 1-10). Since it would have been obvious to provide instructions to read multiple units of information from the package device in Mages, such an operation reads on "another information", as recited in the claim.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 12/20/200, have been fully considered but they are moot in light of the new grounds of rejection.

Art Unit: 2611

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2611

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-6306, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-6296 (for informal or draft communications, please label


"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown whose telephone number is (703) 305-2399. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 830am to 430pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile, can be reached on (703) 305-4380. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-6306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.


ANDREW FAILE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600